Headquarters U.S. Air Force

Integrity - Service - Excellence

AFMS Group

20 Oct 04

1300-1530

U.S. AIR FORCE

U.S. AIR FORCE

AFMS Group Agenda

- **Approval of Minutes** — **5 Min**
- **FY06-11 POM Lessons Learned** — **60 Min**
- **Open Discussion** — **15 Min**

U.S. AIR FORCE

Minutes Approval

- 13 Oct 04 AFMS Group Minutes – Approved?
- Archives of AFMS Corporate Structure minutes can be found at:
  - O:\SG_Common\AFMS Corporate Structure

    - or –
  - https://kx.afms.mil/afmsengineroom

Headquarters U.S. Air Force

Integrity - Service - Excellence

FY06-11 POM Lessons Learned

SGMP
20 October 2004

U.S. AIR FORCE

U.S. AIR FORCE

Overview

- Rules of Engagement
- Discussion Framework
- Review of Questions/Inputs
- SGMP Follow-up

U.S. AIR FORCE

Rules of Engagement

- **Process! Process! Process!**
- **Do Not Revisit FY06 POM Resource Decisions**
- **Keep Focus on improving FY08 POM Process/Tools**
- **Open Dialogue**
- **Make recommendations that benefit the entire AFMS**

U.S. AIR FORCE

Discussion Framework

- Synopsized inputs from MAJCOMs and Panels
- Consolidated similar responses
  - No attempt to evaluate responses
  - Attempted to use common language
- Comments not attributed to source
- Encourage clarification of inputs

U.S. AIR FORCE

1. Do you understand the POM process?

- **The actions that occur after AF/SG submits our data to AF Line and TMA remain unclear**
- **MAPPG did not sufficiently explain the entire process, but subsequent discussions made process clearer and more understandable**
- **Understood basic process, but changes along the way resulted in confusion**
- **Process of amending the program is not clear**
- **No process for establishing AFMS strategic priorities and a viable financial program that Panels could identify**

U.S. AIR FORCE

2. Sufficient/appropriate Guidance?

- **Simpler instructions/processes would be welcome (KISS)**
- **Guidance was responsive to change and sufficient to complete assigned tasks**
- **Biggest problem with the process was the lack of strategic vision or direction; marching orders changed constantly**
- **Guidance provided was good, especially for new personnel**

U.S. AIR FORCE

2a. What Specific Areas Were Lacking?

- Panels should provide full justification why they resourced various product lines the way they did
- Needed guidance on identifying current contracts and how they were laid into the MRT
- A direct help line to the appropriate POC for guidance clarification and training on RAPIDS completion
- Opportunity to provide input to the Panels on numbers prior to presentation at POM meetings
- ROEs on corporate view of D/I/Os evolved between beginning of process and Leesburg #1

U.S. AIR FORCE

2b. What Guidance Was Most Helpful?

- AO training at Andrews AFB
- MAPPG 06 Final Guidance document
- MRT guidance provided online
- One-on-one discussions with SGMP, Panel PEMs, and other Panel members
- Written and verbal guidance was very instructive and helpful

U.S. AIR FORCE

2c. Did the guidance limit your input?

- **Desired additional guidance on how D/I/O justifications work**
- **MAJCOMs spent a great deal of time during VTCs listening to Air Staff develop changes in process**
- **No specific guidance on how MAJCOMs were to staff HAWC positions**
- **D/I/O database only available a few weeks prior to Leesburg; MAJCOMs would have been better prepared to defend/justify positions with earlier release**

U.S. AIR FORCE

3. Working relationship with the Corporate Structure?

- Corporate process is well suited for MAPPG and future year planning/programming
- Working relationship with Panels did not start until after release of MRT; Panels did not provide minutes of VTCs and telecons
- Maintained a healthy working relationship with all levels of the AFMS Corporate Structure
- Engine Room/Programming Staff relationships were consistently helpful
- Interface with the PLATT teams was generally good
- Limited ability or opportunity to integrate across Panels or MAJCOMs

U.S. AIR FORCE

4. Suspense dates for deliverables adequate?

- Suspense dates for the MRT deliverables were not adequate
- Delay of MRT release date left MAJCOMs with an accelerated completion timeline
- Deliverable date for offset drill was very ambitious
- As suspense dates slid to the right early in the process, the revised suspenses were more realistic

5. Leesburg I & II Beneficial and Productive?

- Meetings were essential to full asset visibility across MAJCOMs and AFMS Panels
- Although not all resourcing issues were closed at Leesburg II, it was essential for the most part to wrap up open items from Leesburg I
- Confusing mostly and lengthy, too many line items (1000+) with a group that large
- Would have been even more productive if MAJCOMs were given access to their fellow MAJCOM programs prior to the meetings. This would accommodate some internal check and balance of all programs across the AFMS
- Reviewing every D/I/O was very time consuming, but it was good to see everyone's products

U.S. AIR FORCE

5. Leesburg I & II Beneficial and Productive? (cont.)

- Leesburg II not as productive as Leesburg I. There was a lot of down time for the MAJCOMs
- Not all Panels or all MAJCOMs participated to the same extent and this limited some asset visibility
- Lack of consistency in scoring D/I/Os
- Not all of the decisions made at Leesburg have been implemented
- The process could be improved by defining the roles of the Panels…should only be involved in programming…not execution
- Whole process should have been done as pre-work with the MAJCOMs and Panels before the public meeting

U.S. AIR FORCE

6. Sufficient Tools?

- D/I/O tracker…great tool, Could have used a little earlier
- Our most useful tool was the MRT--Did have some drawbacks
- MRT should be connected to the grade allocation process
- Many of the tools in the MRT did not work
- There were many problems with the web based tool: access, data entry and refresh problems
- Needed capability to “war game” with the MAJCOMs
- Pretty good handle on manpower, but not money
- RAPIDS charts from the OMT were inadequate
- MRT was very helpful though the data was not as accurate as it could be

U.S. AIR FORCE

7. PLATT Information Useful?

- The PLATT models are very informative—perhaps too detailed
- Would be very useful to have a one-page summary that explains how authorizations are earned for a product line
- PLATT information was helpful in identifying the requirements, but not overly useful since the Panels did not always adhere to the PLATT recommendations
- Business plan integration will be complicated by changes in product lines--Results of the PLATT will drive business plan adjustments that haven't been accounted for thus far
- Grade breakdown would be helpful additionally
- The biggest issue with the PLATT standards is that they did not apply to all the FACs

U.S. AIR FORCE

7. PLATT Information Useful? (cont.)

- **Meeting the PLATT standards will break-the-bank for FYDP**
- **Different methodologies were clearly reflected in the wide variation in applicability and lack of interconnectability**
- **Yes, but problems occurred when making the tough choices to not lay in the full PLATT model because of limited TOA**

U.S. AIR FORCE

8a. Full Asset Visibility?

- **Full asset visibility was not truly obtained. For example, in the MRT, not all K/Rs were in the MRT baseline**
- **Going to the RCCC level is too much visibility**
- **Adjusting for external bills has proven to be very painful indeed**
- **Yes–on the manpower side, not as sure on the TOA side (several MAJCOMs) – it seems that most TOA issues were addressed only in terms of how we were going to pay corporate bills**
- **Better visibility of bills is needed**

U.S. AIR FORCE

8b. Sufficient opportunity to vet concerns ?

- **Yes, feel ample opportunity existed for airing concerns at Leesburg I/II**
- **Feel we did not complete our mission when we left. I did not know where our program stood when we left**

U.S. AIR FORCE

8c. Most valuable? Least valuable?

- **Most Valuable: Cross-talk among Air Staff, Panels, MAJCOMs (e.g., during AO Training and Leesburg I/II)**
- **Least Valuable: Often VTCs dominated by internal Air Staff/Panel discussions that did not require MAJCOM participation/time**

U.S. AIR FORCE

9. What would you have done differently?

- Reduce the number of MAJCOM VTCs
- Panels better trained regarding their role and expectations
- Panel meeting minutes prepared
- Realistic suspenses set given MRT release and MAJCOM Line leadership review
- Validated baseline and correct FYDP established in the MRT
- Role of the Panels should be limited to programming
- Initial meeting (like the one we had at Andrews) should have a session of 1-2 days of MAJCOM reps (only 1 per MAJCOM, O4/O5 level) and Air Staff reps (Panel PEMs and SGMP AOs) to discuss process, “nose-to-tail.” Have corporate buy-in of entire process (not just a timeline, but ROE) coming out of the first meeting

U.S. AIR FORCE

9. What would you have done differently? (cont.)

- Better definition up front of what we will do at each phase
- Do the pre-work after initial submissions via VTC with each MAJCOM and the Panels; then a Leesburg-type meeting could be devoted to real major budget and programming issues (versus movement of individual authorizations at the MTF level)
- Established a strategic vision and plan before starting it
- Set the objectives clearly
- The accounting systems need to be aligned to the CS
- Ensured that all the consultants were given the opportunity to participate in the process
- Build the tools to allow for what-if scenarios and ones that process the inputs faster

U.S. AIR FORCE

9. What would you have done differently? (cont.)

- **Ensured all Panels/MAJCOMs follow the same rules**
- **Have better visibility of the current programs and the remaining programs after the POM build (i.e., a before and after look)**

U.S. AIR FORCE

SGMP Follow-up

- **Record responses and discussion**
- **Identify changes/improvements and initiate follow-up action**
- **Feedback to MAJCOMs and Panels on FY08 process improvements**

Meeting Recap & Calendar

U.S. AIR FORCE

- New Items
- Action Items
- Meeting Schedule:
  - AFMS Group: Wed., 27 Oct, 1300-1530 (4th flr conf rm)